Sri Ramajayam.

Sri Sringeri Sarada Mutt

Sankara's Sole Parent Mutt for South India
vith a review of opposition literature, etc.)

By

KAKARALA S. SUNDARAMIAH,
Retired Vakil of Tirunelveli.

with Supplement.

uthor of ETERNAL TRUTH OF SITA DEVI (Valmiki & Kamban),
RAMA SUGRIVA SAKHYAM, a finality to the Vali Episode
iki and Kamban) and YAJUS SANDHYAVANDANAM (with Swaras).
Combined Andhra and Dravida Version.

Printed by the Author for Personal use.

Printed at the

SRI VILASAM PRESS.

SRIRANGAM.

1958

Not for Sale.

Note by the Author.

In Presenting the following thesis for the perusal of Sankara Bhaktas, I pray to be excused for stating candidly. with due reverence to the great, ('எந்தரோ மஹானுபாவுலு ன்ரு, அந்தரிகி வந்தனமு',) that any attempt to create more then four mutts as though by Sankara Bhagavad Pada is far from Truth. One sided propaganda kills truth and 'actual Truth may become stranger than fiction.' But I am certain that untruth can never assume the semblance of truth, and likely to mislead the unwary who form the major portion of the people. The contents of this thesis are mainly from recorded statements etc. and I sincerely hope that genuine Sankara Bhaktas would find this useful to appraise the real value to be given to Sri Adi Sankara Bhagavad Padacharya and his four legitimate mutts founded by Him.

(Sd.) **K. S. Sundaramiah**

5—9—57

ADDENDA

BOOKS REFERRED TO IN CAPITAL LETTERS

'A' Sankara Vijaya Vilasam in Grantha, published in 1876 by Vavilla Ramasami Sastri (சித்விலாச) with a portion of Sivarahasya

'B' Benares Sankara Matha Vimarsanam in 1935

'C' N. K. Venkatesam's book 1915 Edition.

'Cl' N. Venkataraman's book 1923

'D' Arya Dharmam Kumbakonam Mutt Journal started in 191[illegible]

'E' Atreya Krishna Sastrigal's Book 1925 Edition.

'F' Kanchi Mahimai with Kumbakonam Mutt's Preface (முகவுரை) 1927.

'G' Gopinatha Rao's Photo Reprints etc. of 10 Grants in possession of Kumbakonam Mutt in 1916.

'H' Printed Records of Suit 95/1844, printed in 1893-1894

'J' Benares correspondence file.

'K' Sri Kanchi Kamakshi Ambal Sthala Varalaru by Sthanikam Kamakoti Sastri (1957 edition)

Sri Ramajayam.

॥ श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥

CHAPTER I

Sankara's Avatar & Founding of Four Mutts.

'ईशोऽस्ति जन्म च विचित्रतरं हि जन्तोः... ।'

1. Startling is the nature of Living beings. But God is great and above all (with the teachings of the Vedic Culture in this Punya Bhumi). Yet re-actionary revolutionists exist. Such was the state of this Aryavarta 2500 years ago, when the Great Sankara Bhagavad Padacharya appeared on the scene with his Ever Lasting Advaitic doctrine and to give a proper lead to the performance of the dictates of vedic culture. Re-actionaries were driven out of the Country as a result of His founding 4 Mutts to look after the four directions; Sringeri Sarada Mutt with Suresvara charya as head for the South, Dwaraka Mutt for the west, Govardhana Mutt for the east and Jyotir Mutt at Badari for the north. The status of these four Mutts finds prominence in the 84th Namavali in Jagadguru Ashtotra Namavali 'चतुर्दिक् चतुराम्नाय प्रतिष्ठिता ।' All the legitimate four Mutts are exercising their territorial jurisdiction in the 4 directions as well.

2. Pleasant memories come to my mind at the mere thought of Sringeri, the famous Asrama of the Sage Rishya-Sringa, the High Priest of King Dasaratha's Putrakameshti Yaga, which resulted in the avatar of Vishnu as Sri Rama (and Sita Devi as avatar of Lakshmi) to put down the Ten-Headed Ravana, a terror to the world. It has also been my good fortune to publish two books 'Eternal Truth of Sita Devi' and 'Rama Sugriva Sakhyam' the one showing that Sita Devi in Sundara Kanda (Sarga 42)

in her reply to Rakshasis was ever truthful, and the other upholding the Dharma Samsthapana of Sri Rama in the much debated Vali episode, giving a finality to the said two disputed topics in Ramayana. It is a source of immense satisfaction and pleasure to all genuine Vedic Culture lovers that Adi Sankaracharya as an Avatara of Lord Parameswara, should have chosen this sacred Asrama of Sage Rishya Sringa to establish his Sarada Mutt with Sureswaracharya as the Head and inculcate the Vedic Doctrine of "ADVAITA" to all living in the South from the Vindhya Mountains to Kanyakumari. Among the galaxy of the illustrious and legitimate successors of the Sringeri Mutt, may be mentioned, sage Vidya Tirtha, Sage Vidyaranya who gave in addition a royal status to the Sringeri Mutt, with the necessary Royal paraphernalia, Abhinava Narsimha Bharati Swami, who constructed the Adi Sankara temple and other temples at Kaladi, the birth place of Adi Sankara, on the 19th February 1910, and his illustrious successor, the Late Jagadguru Chandrasekhara Bharati, with his eternal teaching, "Vedo nityam-adhiyatam." 'वेदो नित्यमधीयताम् ।'

3. The traditional aud historic background for the installation of Sri Sarada Devi in the Sringeri Mutt with Sureswaracharya as head, etc. is found in a printed book (Ref. A.) in Grantha characters in the year 1876 A. D. by Vavilla Ramaswami Sastrulu, called 'Sankara Vijaya Vilasam' (with only a portion of the genuine "Siva Rahasya") which contains the following Slokas:—

शिवरहस्यनवमांशे षोढशाध्याये —

ईश्वर उवाच —

'मदंशतस्त्वं जातोऽसि भुवि चाद्वैतसिद्धये ।
पापमिश्राश्रितैर्मार्गैः जैनदुर्बुद्धिबाधकैः ॥ ३७ ॥

भिन्नवैदिकसंसिद्धे अद्वैते द्वैतवाक्यतः ।
तद्भेदगिरिवज्रस्त्वं सञ्जातोऽसि मदंशतः ॥ ३८ ॥

दुर्वासश्शापतो भूमौ जातां वाणीं विजित्य ताम् ।
अगस्त्यचरिते देशे तुङ्गातीरे सुनिर्मले ॥ ३९ ॥

पुण्यक्षेत्रे द्विजवर ! स्थापयित्वा सुपूजय ।
यत्रास्ते ऋष्यशृङ्गस्य महर्षेराश्रमो महान् ॥ ४० ॥

कलावपि ततोऽद्वैतमार्गः ख्यातो भविष्यति । Slokas Contd. in P. 5.

शङ्करविजय विलासे अध्याय २४.

सद्योगकरणासक्ते लग्ने महति पूजिते ।
वाणीस्थापनमातिष्ठत्यस्मिन् देशिकपुङ्गवे ॥ १८ ॥

इत्थं विचार्य चतुरः श्रीमान् देशिकचन्द्रमाः ।
वाग्देव्यास्सविधे नित्यं गोपुराट्टालशोभितम् ॥ ३१ ॥

श्रीमठं तत्र निर्माय विद्यापीठमचीक्लृपत् ।
चतुर्ष्वेकं वावदूकं सुरेशाचार्यमग्रियम् ॥ ३२ ॥

ब्रह्मविद्यावरिष्ठं तं तत्पीठे विनिवेश्य सः ।
आजिज्ञपत् सुरेशार्यम् इत्थं देशिकपुङ्गवः ॥ ३३ ॥

यस्त्वद्वैतमते स्थित्वा भारतीपीठनिन्दकः ।
स याति नरकं घोरं यावदाभूतसंप्लवम् ॥ ३४ ॥

आसेतुहिमवच्छैलं सदाचारान् विचारय ।
यत्र स्खलति यः को वा विप्रस्तं शिक्षयाऽधिकम् ॥ ३५ ॥

संप्रदायान् दशैवैतान् शिष्येष्वारचय स्वतः ।
"तीर्थाश्रमवनारण्यगिरिपर्वतसागराः ॥ ३६ ॥

सरस्वती भारती च पुरीत्येते दशैव हि ।"

शिवात्क्रमात् समायात चन्द्रमौलीश्वरं परम् ।
रत्नगर्भं गणपतिं पूजयेति ददौ मुदा ॥ ३७ ॥

कारयामास तेनैव स्वीयभाष्यार्थवार्तिकम् ।
सविधे निवसन्नेव शरदो नव पञ्च च ॥ ३८ ॥

वाग्देव्याः पूजनं कुर्वन् अवसत्तेन तन्मठे ।
मलहानिकरं देवं प्रत्यहं पूजयन् सुधीः ॥ ३९ ॥

(Ref :- also in Pages 17 to 19 of B). Herein the main incidents of Adi Sankara Bhagavatpadacharya's doings at Sringeri are narrated viz. Vani's Sthapanam, Peetha Pratishtha, Sureswaracharya's sthapanam, etc.

4. The detailed incidents of Adi Sankara's life and doings have been correctly chronicled by Sage Vidyaranya, the head of the Sringeri Mutt, in his book known as Madhaviya Sankara Vijaya (Printed in Poona about 1891). This has to be taken as the only leading authority for all genuine Sankara Bhaktas to follow. The Advaitic doctrine of Sri Sankara has taken firm root in the whole of this Aryavarta inclusive of the South also wherein the Sringeri Sarada Mutt was founded. Scholars, Pandits, Sannyasins etc. scattered in various parts, too numerous to mention, always, looked to Sringeri Sarada Mutt for their spiritual guidance. It may be also casually mentioned that Sringeri Mutts owns a number of Mutt buildings in the South (even at Tirupati, Madras, Kanchi, and other places) managed by their agents or deputies, besides the voluntary offerings of many of their Bhaktas throughout the country.

Note :—In Big Conjeevaram, known as Siva Kanchi. The Sringeri Mutt owns an ancient big building etc. (with கல்மண்டபம். about 70' x 80') door No. 38, on the Southern row of the chalai street. The buildlng is named Sringeri Sankara Matham. Lord Ekambaranatha tcpmle is about a furlong on the north and the Kamakshi temple is about 2 furlongs east of the Sringeri Matham. The Varadaraja Swami temple is in Chinnakanchi Known as Vishnu Kanchi about 2 miles on the east. Both the Kanchis are now of contiguous formation and are on the north of the river Vegavati. The K. Mutt Swamiji is at present residing in the street which is on a western Continuation of the South Mada Street. inhabited chiefly by Vaishnavas of the Little Kanchi Varadaraja Swami (K. S. S. 19—8—57.)

5. The main incidents of Adi Sankara's life are also found in the genuine Sivarahasya. The following from the Grantha readings printed and published even in the last century and adopted by unbiassed scholars and Pandits all over the country, are given for the reader's reference:—

Note:—I am now in possession of an old printed copy (Grantha) Containing also the following slokas शिवरहस्य Swarahasya

द्वात्रिंशत् परमायुस्ते शीघ्रं कैलासमावस ॥ ४१ ॥ Contd. from p. 3.

एतत्प्रतिगृह्य त्वं पंचलिंगं सुपूजय ।

भस्मरुद्राक्षसम्पन्नः पञ्चाक्षरपरायणः ॥ ४२ ॥

शतरुद्रावर्तनैश्च तारेण भसितेन च ।

बिल्वपत्रैश्च कुसुमैः नैवेद्यैर्विविधैरपि ।
त्रिवारं सावधानेन गच्छ सर्वजयाय च ॥ ४३ ॥

त्वदर्थे कैलासाचलवरसुपावीगतमहा-
समुद्यच्छन्द्राभं स्फटिकधवलं लिंगकुलकम् ।
समासीनस्सोमोद्भिमलमणिमौल्यर्चय परम्
कलौ लिंगार्चायां भवति हि विमुक्तिः परतरा ॥ ४४ ॥

स शङ्करो मां प्रणनाम मस्करी यशस्करी तस्करवर्यमार्ये ।
संगृह्य लिंगान्निजगाम वेगात् भूमौ स बुद्धार्हतमित्रजैनान् ॥ ४५ ॥

तद्योगभोगवरमुक्तिसुमोक्षयोगलिंगार्चनाप्राप्तजयः स कामम् ।
तान्वै विजित्य तरसा क्षतशास्त्रजालैः मिश्रांस्ततो नैजमवाप लोकम् ॥ ४६ ॥

स काञ्च्यां तपस्सिद्धिमवाप्य दण्डी चण्डीशरूपो जगदाकलय्य ।
ब्रह्मैकविद्यां रचयन्सभाष्यं शारीरकंनाम जगाद मोदात् ॥ ४७ ॥

व्यासेन संभाष्य समेत्य काशीं तन्मण्डनार्यं परिखण्ड्य वाणीम् ।
जेतुं शरीरान्तरमेत्य कामकलां जगाहे प्रमदा नराभ्यः ॥ ४८ ॥

पुनः स्वकं देहमवाप्य तूर्णं पूर्णं निजं काममथाकलय्य ।
वाणीं स जित्वैव तु तां मठे स्वे शृङ्गेरिकाख्ये प्रणिवेश्य तुष्टः ॥ ४९ ॥

कापालिकं तं क्रकचं महोग्रं कर्णाटदेशे निखिलं विजित्य ।
गोकर्णमासाद्य तमीशमीढ्यं स्तुत्वा महाराष्ट्रपदं प्रपेदे ॥ ५० ॥

तत्र स्थितान् भास्करभट्टमुख्यान् तं नीलकण्ठं च तृणीकरिष्यन् ।
काश्मीरमासाद्य स शारदायाः सर्वज्ञपीठं परमारुरुक्षन् ॥ ५१ ॥

तत्र स्थितान्संप्रति सर्वपण्डितान् चार्वाकमुख्यान् विपुलान् विजित्य ।
सदक्षिणद्वारस्थकवाटभेदं कृत्वा स देव्या विनिशङ्क्यमानः ॥ ५२ ॥

शङ्कां निराकृत्य निविश्य पीठे ततो बदर्याश्रममाप दण्डी ।
नारायणं तत्र तपज्वलौघं कुण्डं प्रशीतस्य निवारणाय ॥ ५३ ॥

ध्यात्वा शिवं तत्र निविश्य तस्थौ कैलासदेशात् वृषभस्य देवाः ।
समेत्य संस्तुत्य यदायुषस्ते कालोऽगम त्वं वृषभेऽधिरोह ॥ ५४ ॥

इति प्रचीर्णं प्रभुरात्मनिश्वे विचिन्त्य शिष्यान् निजगाद मोदात् ।
यूयं चतुर्दिक्षु मठेषु लिंगैः साकं वसन्त्विति उपदिश्य हर्षात् ॥ ५५ ॥

विवेश पृष्ठं वृषभस्य हस्तं संगृह्य वैरिञ्चिमथास्य दत्तम् ।
सर्वैश्च देवैरभिनन्द्यमानः स शंकरस्तत्रिजगाम देवः ॥ ५६ ॥

विवेश कैलास निवेशमच्छं सच्छब्दवृन्दारकबृन्दपूर्वम् ।
तदादि तच्छंकरभाष्यमेतत् भूमौ मुक्तिपदं ददाति ॥ ५७ ॥ ज्ञानं

एतत्तेऽभिहित देवि ! मुख्यं मुक्तिपदावहम् ।
शांकरं चरितं लोके भविष्यति न संशयः ॥ ५८ ॥

इति श्रुत्वा महेशानाच्छरितं शंकरस्य सा ।
पुलकांकुरसंहृष्टा प्रणनाम महेश्वरम् ॥ ५९ ॥
Vide supplement.

In the said Slokas the complete attainment of Sri Sankara's mission and the main incidents of his life are narrated viz. the writing of Sutra Bhshyas, the Interview and approbation by Sage Vyasa at Kasi, the defeat of Mandana Misra and Sarasvati, the Parakayapravesa for experiencing Kamakala, the consecration and Installation of Sri Sarada Devi at Sringeri, his victorious tour in Karnataka, Maharashtra, Gokarna, etc., his ascension of -

Sarvajna Pitha at Kashmir, the creation of hot springs at Badari, the establishment of the four Mutts in the four directions and his final return to Kailasa.

Note :—The readers will judge for themselves whether any Siva Rahasya version of Adi Sankara's doings, which omits the said main incidents, can ever be treated as complete. At any event, the reading of the 46th sloka as printed above is also found in the latest Grantha edition of 'Chidvilasa Yatindra Pranita Sankara Vilasam' published by one Swaminatha Sastri (at the Sastra Sanjeevani Press, Madras in 1917). But the said sloka along with others has undergone many variations in recent years and they would be dealt with in this thesis (vide Chapter V Para *4*.)

CHAPTER II

'Secession' of Kumbakonam Mutt

1. In this democratic age, the above said four Mutts and Pithas are however not the only institutions of their kind in India. As a multitude of Sannyasins misnamed Mathadhipatis exist, so also a plethora of Pithas and Mutts crop up. In the South their number is galore, but most of them are content to accept the fact that Sri Sankara founded only the said Four Mutts and that they represent some branches of the said Mutts either as their agents or deputies or followers of the same, which were alone considered as their parent Mutts in the exercise of their territorial jurisdiction.

2. But it is surprising to note that one such institution— the Kumbakonam Mutt—admittedly under the jurisdiction or control of the Sringeri Mutt, should revolt against the Parent Mutt and carry on intense and novel propaganda (with the help of their influential sishyas

scattered throughout the country). Their new contention or claim seems to be that Kumbakonam Mutt Swamiji is the direct and lineal descendant and successor to the fifth or central Mutt founded by Adi Sankara at Kanchi, to exercise supervision and control over the other four established Mutts, with a further claim for them alone the unique position of Jagadguru and that their Mutt is the only institution, the head of which alone is entitled to be designated as 'Sri Jagad Guru Sankaracharya' while the heads of the other Mutts cannot aspire to any things higher than the title of plain Sankaracharya! (Ref. Pages 32, 34 and 35 of B).

It is needless to say that this exaggerated and fanciful claim of the Kumbakonam Mutt finds no support in any authorised, authoritative or genuine text books. Even the 81st Namavali of the Kumbakonam Mutt revised Ashtottara Sata Nama "Kanchyam Srichakrarajakya yantra sthapana dikshitah" refers to only a Yantra Sthapana [and that too only to make the Ugra Kamakshi into a Santa Murti— "Saumya vapusham" vide Kumbakonam Mutt's "Kanchi Mahimai Mukhavurai" extracted as though from Prachina Sankara Vijaya and the wording is 'உக்கிரமான பராசக்தியை சாந்த மூர்த்தியாகச் செய்தார்' Ref. F. V.) i.e. only 'ஜீர்ணோத்தாரணம்' and not newly installed प्रतिष्ठा ~~B. (P. 16 of~~ K) "Ugramana Parasaktiyai santha murtiyahaccheyar" Ref: F]. There is no reliable authority to show that Adi Sankara had has final emancipation at Kanchi.

3. It is also strange, but significant, that not even the K. Swamiji's diplomatic speech (in reply) made by him at Benares on 7th October 1934 could possibly *Advance* the merits of the new claim of Kumbakonam Mutt. The speech is reported in "Hindu" and published in the Paper "Pandita Patra" on 15—10—34 (Ref: P. 66-67 of B). I have given a Tamil and English Translation of the same for the readers to judge for themselves whether the new claim has been substantiated at all.

4. The speech in Tamil would be.—

'*15—10—34* தேதி பண்டிதபத்ராவில் பக்கம் 4, 7—10—34 'ஸாங்க வேத வித்யாலயத்தில் கும்பகோணம் மடாதிபதியின் உபந்யாஸம்: மடத்தின் பிரதான்ய அப்பிரதான்யத்தை நிர்ணயம் செய்வதைக்குறித்து, என்றால் சொல்லக்கூடியது என்ன வென்றால் எனக்கு வேதம் சாஸ்திரத்தின் அர்த்தத்தை நிர்ணயம் செய்யத்தான் அதிகாரமுண்டு. ஆனால் பீடத்தின் பிரதான்ய நிர்ணயம் என்னுடைய அதிகாரத்திற்கு உட்பட்டதல்ல இந்த வேலை சாஸ்திரஞான பக்தர்களுடையது அவர்கள் எப்படி வைக்கிறார்களோ அவ்விதம் நான் இருப்பேன் அவர்களுடைய நிர்ணயம்தான் நிர்ணயமாகும் எப்படி ஒரு டாக்டர் தன்னுடைய வைத்தியத்திற்காக வேறு டாக்டரை அழைக்கிறானோ அதைப் போல என்னுடைய வார்த்தைகளும் இன்னொருவருடைய நிர்ணயத்தில் விடவேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. தாங்கள் தங்களுடைய ஸ்வய அபிமானத்தை விட்டு விட்டு எப்படிவேண்டுமானால் நிர்ணயம் கொடுங்கள். நான் கூட என்னுடைய பீடத்தில் உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டு யோகேச்வர லிங்கத்தின் அர்ச்சனை பண்ணுகிறேன். நான் கூட அவருடைய தாஸனாவேன். நான் பெரியவனா? சின்னவனா? எனக்கென்ன தெரியும்? உபாதி கொடுக்கிறவர்களுக்குத்தான் தெரியும். நான் இதனை (பீடம் பிராதான்ய அபிப்பிராதான்ய) நிர்ணயம் செய்பவனாக எப்படி இருக்கமுடியும்.?

'जगद्गुरु शब्द आदि श्री शंकर को मुख्य रूप से लगता है और मैं अपने बारे में उसे बहुव्रीहि समास में समझता हूं जगत् जिसका गुरु हो। जगत् ही मेरा गुरु है।'

ஜகத்குருசப்தம் ஆதி ஸ்ரீ சங்கருடைய முக்கிய ரூபத்திலிருந்து உண்டாகிறது. நான் என்னுடைய விஷயத்தில் பஹுவிரிஹீ ஸமாஸம் என்று நினைக்கிறேன் ஜகத் எதனுடைய குருவோ, அந்த ஜகத்தான் என்னுடைய குரு'

5. The same in English would be:—

"Regarding the supremacy or otherwise of the Mutt, I can only say that I am competent to deal with interpretation of Vedas, Sastras, etc. but I have no authority to speak on the relative greatness (Pradhanya) of the Mutt. It is the duty of the Bhaktas well versed in

Sastras. I shall abide by their decision and their opinion only can be a proper one. Just as another doctor is requisitioned to treat a doctor in distress, I have to leave the same to others. Leave off self interest and give any decision, As for myself, I will sit at the Pitha and perform archana to the Yogesvaralingam. I am also His devotee. What do I know if I am great or small? It is known only to those that cause the trouble. How can I be a judge to determine the greatness or otherwise of the Pitham? The term Jagadguru is from the Chief Rupa of Adi Sankara. So far as I am concerned, it has to be construed in 'Bahuvrihi compound' "Whose Guru is Jagat, that Jagat is my Guru".

6. Such a state ment of the Swamiji at the Sacred Banares appears to be in direct contrast to his earlier views expressed by him in 1927 in his speech at Nerunjippettai on 13—4—1927, The speech is reported in Tamil in the Mutt's Journal, "Arya Dharmam" in 1927 (vide Pages 298 and 308 of D). There in he has quoted (or misquoted?) Madhaviyam and the following Mutt literature :—

Keraliyam, Sankara Vijaya Vilasam, Sankarabhyudayam, Anandagiri's Sankara Vijayam, Gururathna Malika, Vyasachaliya Sankara Vijayam, Patanjali Charitam, Brahmanda Purana-anthargata Markandeya Samhita, Sivarahasyam and finally Naishadham, etc in support of the new claim made by the Kumbakonam Matta.

Page 298 of Arya Dharmam 1927 Lecture on 13-4-27:-

"இக் கிரந்தங்களில் இச் சரித்திரத்தை ஆரம்பித்திருக்கும் பிரகாரத்தையும் மத்தியில் உள்ள விஷயங்களையும் சுருக்கமாகச் சொல்லி ஒவ்வொரு கிரந்தங்களுக்குமுள்ள விரோதத்தையும் அதற்கு புராண வசனங்களையும் அனுகுணமாக யுக்தியைக் கொண்டு எல்லா கிரந்தங்களுக்கும் ஐகமத்யத்தை விளக்கிக் காட்டி தகுந்த சமாதானத்தையும் சொல்லி ... ... 5 லிங்கங் களில், யோக லிங்கத்தை மூலாம்னாய பீடமாகிய ஸ்ரீ காஞ்சியில் ஸ்தாபனம் செய்தார்களென்றும், இதை அர்ச்சிப்பவர் பிரம்ம

சர்யத்திலிருந்தே ஸன்யாஸம் பெற்றவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டுமென்றும் இதை உத்தேசித்துத்தான் ஆதி ஆசார்யள், இந்த பீடத்தில் கிருஹஸ்தாச்ரமத்திலிருந்து ஸந்யாஸம் பெற்ற சுரேச்வரர் இருக்கும் போதே, பிரம்மசர்யத்திலிருந்தே ஸன்யாஸம் கொடுக்கப்பட்ட ஸர்வக்ஞர் என்பவரை ஸ்தாபனம் செய்தாரென்றும், கடைசியாக தனது 32 வதுவயது முடிவில் இக் காஞ்சியில் தான் தனது ஸ்வரூபத்துடன் கலந்தாரென்றும்... ... (P, 308) தவிர காஞ்சியில் யோகலிங்கத்தை ஸ்தாபனம் செய்தாரென்றவிஷயத்தை நைஷதம் 12வது ஸர்க்கத்தில் தமயந்தி ஸ்வயம்வர மண்டபத்தில் காஞ்சிமகாராஜாவைப் பற்றிச்சொல்லி வருமிடத்தில் ஸ்ரீ ஹர்ஷர் என்ற மஹாகவியும் அனுவாதனம் செய்திருக்கிறார் என்றும்...நிர்விவாதமாக உபன்யஸித்தார்கள்."

Note:-That Sureswara was not competent to do puja with Yoga lingam is directly contradicted by the K. mutt Swamy's statement in para 20 found in page 70 of 'H' which runs thus :—

காஞ்சிபுரத்திலிருக்கிற மடத்தில் முதல் பிரவாதியவர்களுடைய பரம குருஸ்வாமிகள் அபிப்பிராயப்பட்டு சுரேசுவராசாரியரால் பூஜித்து வந்த யோகலிங்கமென்கிற சந்திரமௌலீச்வர சுவாமியுடன் கும்பகோணத்திலிருந்த மடத்துக்கு வந்து வாஸம் செய்தவர்களுக்கு."

Even Anandagiri's version Contains Ref. P. R. 14. C.

'सुरेश्वरं आहूय योगनाम लिङ्गं पूजयेति दत्वा'

How far the said texts would snpport the new claim has been well discussed and criticized by eminent Pandits, Scholars and Matadhipatis in the 19th and 20th Centuries in an impartial manner and they have come to the conclusion completely negativing the new claim of the Kambakonam Mutt. More about this later in this thesis.

CHAPTER III

Kumbakonam Mutt in the 18th and 19th Centuries.

1. "Man is a creature of circumstances" and it may not be far wrong to say that the Mutt with their enthusiasts, backed up by the Power, wealth and plenty of

their influential Sishyas scattered throughout the Country, unwittingly succumb themselves to the fancied greatness thrust upon them. There are no reliable authorities regarding the permanent status of the Mutt prior to 1729 according to Mr. Venkatesam, between 1740 to 1763 or 1821 according to Atreya Sastrigal, when admittedly' the Mutt is alleged to have removed bag and baggage to **Kumbakonam** where they remain even today and the Mutt had nothing to do with Kanchi affairs after these dates for over a century. An appellate judgement of the Chingleput Sub Court in 1935 apparently gives a clue regarding the same with reference to the status of the Mutt adopted by them as Plaintiff in the said suit to receive some voluntary contribution called "Merai" in the Chingleput District. From the judgement of the Sub Judge dismissing the Mutt's claim, briefly reported in the Madras "Swadesamitran" dated 15—8—35, the description and name of the Plaintiff Mutt is shown thus :—

"மேரைவசூல் வழக்கு. ஸ்ரீசங்கராசாரியாருக்கு எதிராக அப்பீல் முடிவு நமது நிருபர் செங்கல்பட்டு 14—8—35. சிக்குடையார் ஸ்வாமி என்கிற ஸ்ரீ காமகோடி பீடாதிபதி ஜகத்குரு ஸ்ரீ சங்கராசாரியாளின் சார்பாக செங்கல்பட்டு ஜில்லா முனிசிப் கோர்ட்டில் தொடர்ந்த வழக்கில் டி ஸ்வாமிக்கு பல்லாவரம், ஆதம்பாக்கம், திருவான்மியூர் முதலிய ஜமீன் கிராமக்குடியானவர்கள் மேரை என்கிற வரியைக் கொடுக்கக் கடமைப்பட்டவர்களென்று, ஜில்லா முனிசிபு அளித்த தீர்ப்பை ரத்து செய்து வழக்கை தள்ளியிருப்பதாக, திங்கட்கிழமை தினம் Chingleput Sub Judge R. Vembu Iyer அப்பீலில் தீர்ப்புக் கூறினர்."

Sikkudayar Swami alias Sri **Kamakoti** Peetadhipathi Jagadguru Sankarachariar is the name adopted by the Mutt as Plaintiff. Such a transformation of a Sikkudayar Swami *to claim the all India title* of **Jagadguru** may not be improbable in the case of the Mutt backed up with the lavish gifts of **Rajas**, etc. And there are no authentic records to show the history of the **Mutt** before and after their alleged migration to **Kumbakonam** with Swarna

Kamatshi except, those kept in the labyrinths of the Mutt or left with their trusted 'chief Priest of Sankaracharya' or Sishyas manipulated from time to time, while some portions of which alone see the light of day only in this *20th* Century; and they are gradually being published through their sishyas in support of their new claim in the shape of books published with the kind permission of the Mutt or dedicated to the Mutt, besides some one-sided reviews in the Mutt Propaganda Journals. Besides the prapaganda made in Benaras in 1915, by the K. Mutt's agent, One such book appears in 1915 by Mr. N. K. Venkatesam, Lecturer of the Kumbakonam College and the other with a lot of varied versions and dates in 1925 by one Atreya Krishna Sastrigal a Tamil Pandit of Lalgudi. It is there stated that the Mutt migrated to Tanjore at the request of Tanjore Maharaja & finally to Kumbakonam in 1729, (Ref: P. 31–32 in C) according to Mr. N. K. Venkatesam, or in 1740–1763 or 1821 according to Atreya Krishna Sastrigal (Ref: E). But Mr. N. Venkataraman in his book published in 1923 states that the Kanchi Matha was transferred to Kumbakonam in the end of the 18th century.

Thus there is no consistancy in the said versions Re. removal of Swarna Kamakshi to Tanjore and another date is given by Dr. M. K. Srinivasan in his book Kanchi temples published in may 1957 A. D. at P. 32 is found:—
'இக்கோவிலிலிருந்த பங்காரு காமாட்சி யென்கிற ஸ்வர்ண காமாக்ஷி விக்ரஹத்தை *1767* (AD)ம் வருஷம் ஹைதர் அலி செய்த கலகததின்போது தஞ்சாவூருக்குக் கொண்டு போய் வைத்திருந்தார்கள்.

Anyhow the Mutt should have completely lost control of Kanchi affairs including Kamakshi Temple and that the Mutt continued to stay at Kumbakonam up today. It is also stated that the Rajah of Tanjore made some Swarna Abhishekam some time prior to 1849 and permanently built a mutt building only in 1821. The followiug amazing statement is found in page 40 of 'E' (1925 Edition.)

" ஸ்வாமிகள் காவேரி தீரத்தில் விஜயம் செய்ய விரும்பியதால் ஸ்ரீ தஞ்சாவூர் மகாராஜா அவர்கள் 1821ம் வருஷத்தில் கும்பகோணத்தில் ஒரு அழகிய ஒரு மடம் கட்டுவித்தார்கள். அது முதல் ஸ்ரீ காமகோடி ஸ்வாமிகள் கும்பகோணத்தில் வஸித்து வந்ததை அறியாதார் யார் ?'

In view of the conflicting versions shown above the alleged migration of the Kumbakonam mutt varies from 1729 AD to 1821 AD.

2. With A long stay of more than one century at Kumbakonam surrounded by partizans etc. endowed with keen and tactful intellect and backed up with the lavish gifts of Tanjore Rajahs etc, the Mutt enthusiasts might have lost their balance of mind in assuming an All-India title. It is therefore not surprising that this Sikkudayar Swami, who should have owed former allegiance to the Sringeri Mutt at the most a deputy, should have encroached upon tne rights and properties of the Sringeri Mutt. by asserting independence for themselves, besides naming their Mutt also as Sarada Mutt (a clover camouflage!). For this purpose a house seems to have been purchased in Kanchi and the mutt seems to have been newly built in Kanchi abont 150 yards east of the Sringeri Sankara matam.' Archaeologist Gopinatha Rao in his Mutt Copper Plates Publication 1916 says (Preface in G), " It is only at a comparatively later period, a new Matha seems to have been erected in Siva Kanchi and that the tradition of their removal to Tanjore which is comparatively a recent one and consequently (not?) worth believing". Such a move seems to have been strongly condemned by Maha Mahopadhyaya Kokkanda Venkataratnam Panthulu of the Andhra Desa in a printed publication SANKARA MATHA TATTVA PRAKSIKA (Ref. J.), in the later half of the 19th Century. He seems to have stated there, in a condemnatory language that the Kumbakonam Mutt bought a Sudra house in Kanchi and newly built a Mutt there in the later half of the 19th Century. Regarding this Publication, Page 63 of 'B'

contains:— "We hope that the religious world is not unaware of the honest production of the Late Mahamahopadhyaya Kokkanda Venkataratnam Panthulu with reference to the Mutt (Kumbakonam). It speaks very bad of it and is left uncondemned by the responsible heads of the said Mutt for the last 60 years," (i. e. prior to 1934)

Note:—Pages 61–65 of 'B' contain Swami Brahmananda Sarasvati's letter of protest to K. Mutt, with also Sriyuta Rajagopala Sarma's letter in July 1934. re. Kokkanda' book.] —'B' & J'

3. One Sudarsana Mahadevandra Sarasvati. the alleged 63rd head of the Mutt (between 1849—1889) "started an all India tour (to Kasi apparently with the new title), but when he went as far as Jagannath he had to return about 1889 owing to some obstacles' (Ref: P. 33 of C & J). The obstacles should have been of the Mutts own making in attempting to create a new claim for the Mutt. They shonld have got themselves entangled and the result might have been that the Mutt found a number of enemies when they moved out of Kumbakonam with their new claim. Mahamahopadhyaya Kokkanda Venkataratnam Panthulu's attack referred to above may also be taken as the immediate cause. Such a new ciaim seems to have irritated *also* the learned scholars, Mahants and Matadhipatis at Benares *also*. In the year 1886 (stated to be Vikrama Saka), there-was a conference of Pandits and Matadhipatis at Benares otherwise known as Benares Vyavastha of Vikrama Saka). It was then resolved that Adi Sankara founded only four Mutts and the new claim of the Kumbakonam Mutt was thereby negatived. This resolution of 1886 has also been signed by 79 heads of Mutts and Pandits, five of whom happen to be ~~the~~ Pandits of South India. (Ref: P 6 of 'B' and J.)

Signatory No. 54 is Bhatta Sri Sitarama Sastri; No. 58 is Maha-Mahopadhyaya Subrahmania Sastrigal, the famous Pandit, the Father-in-law of Maha Mahopadhyaya Pandit

Lakshmana Sastri and uncle of Pandit Raja Brahma Sri Rajeswara Sastri and one of the Adhyakshas of Sanga Veda Vidyalaya, Kasi; No. 60 is late Rajeswara Sastri; No. 63 is Mysore Rama Sastri (signed in Tamil) and No. 65 is Dam. (डं) Visvanatha Sastri (signed in Telugu).

It is therefore not surprising that the then Swamiji's good sense prevailed and that he had to return with a 'Retreat in good order' (I my add here that this resolution of 1886 was later confirmed with greater vehemance in 1934). But the Mutt enthusiasts would not accept defeat. They began to do intense propaganda after their historic Retreat in 1889, and more so specially after the present Swamiji was installed in April 1907 at the age of 12. It may be stated also for information that his predecessor apparently in teens, mysteriously lived only for 7 days.

CHAPTER IV

Kumbakonam Mutt Propaganda - XX Century

The present Swamiji took charge of the Mutt control in 1914. He, by his 'Tantric' powers, perseverence and diplomatic tact, has gathered a lot of admirers and sishyas from all communities and H. H. was also enamoured of the All-India Title, Jagadguru. Intense propaganda is being done even today, to mislead the innocent and god-fearing Baktas owing allegiance to the four genuine Sankara Mutts founded by Adi Sankara. It may be said at the outset, that till 1910, the Kumbakonam Mutt claimed only an exclusive territorial jurisdiction in some eastern portion of South India and they even went to the length of saying that Sringeri Mutt could not even enter places in their jurisdiction !! But strangely enough this was given up, by claiming the 'All India Title':

2. The initiation of the Mutt propaganda began at Benares In 1915 by the issue of a notification in a book form (in the Hitachintaka Press, Benares) by the former

agent of the Mutt. one Pandit Ramasami Sastri of Tirukodikaval, claiming for the Mutt the sole and exclusive monopoly of 'Jagadguru' Title.

3. Mr. N. K. Venkatesam, Lecturer in the Kumbakonam College published a book in 1915 (Printed at Madras , 'Sri Sankaracharya and his Kamakoti Mutt' dedicated to the head of the Kumbakonam Mutt, a revised edition of the same with some variation appeared in 1931. similar to the one noted in para 2 & 3.

4. In 1916, a vernacular Journal called 'Arya-Dharmam' was started to do propaganda work of the Mutt. It may be stated here that this Journal contains many self-serving reviews of some of the Mutt Literature kept concealed in the Mutt premises at Kumbakonam, etc.

5. Mr. N. Venkataraman, Lecturer in Vizianagaram College published 'Sankaracharya, the Great and his successors at Kanchi' in 1923 and dedicated to the Mutt. Curiously enough, he quotes a passage referring to the Kumbakonam Mutt from C. N. K. Iyer; M. A. L. T's book on 'The Life of Sankara,' which runs as follows:—"There has been however one small secession caused in the South by the establishment of Kumbakonam Mutt which has a limited following in Tanjore and adjoining districts, That this Mutt is comparatively modern appears to be probable, the exact age cannot be ascertained."

6. Atreya Krishna Sastrigal, Tamil Pandit Lalgudi, Published a rather detailed book in classical Tamil (Printed at the Komalambika Press, Kumbakonam) with some new versions and dates and at variance with the other books referred to above.

7. In 1927, the Komalambika Press, published another book in Tamil called 'Kanchi Mahimai'. The preface to the said book, i.e, 'Mukhavurai' is misnamed 'Sri Kanchi Mukhavurai' and it contains almost all the slokas

relied on by the Mutt in support of their new claim. And a most astonishing Sloka No. 31 as though, from Gurunatha Malika is given with a Tamil translation namely

'உலகில் தர்மாதர்மங்களை நன்கு வியவஸ்தை செய்யவேண்டியதின் பொருட்டு தேவதைகளால் ஸேவிக்கத் தகுந்ததாயும் ஸேது ஹிமாசலம் வரையிலுள்ள புண்ய பூமியில் வஸிக்கும் சகல வர்ணாச்ரமிகளாலும் நமஸ்கரிக்கத் தகுந்ததுமான, ஸ்ரீ சாரதா மடத்தையும் ஸ்ரீ காஞ்சியில் ஸ்தாபித்தவர்களான ஆசார்யாள் நமக்கு அதிகமான சிரேயஸ்ஸைக் கொடுக்கட்டும்.'

Another astonishing sloka as though from Vyasachaliya is also quoted with a Tamil translation:—

'இவ்விதம் ஸரஸ்வதியை வாதத்தில் ஜயித்து ஸர்வக்ஞ பீடம் ஆரோஹணம் செய்து காஞ்சியில் தன்னால் ஸ்தாபிக்கப் பட்ட மடத்தில்.........சிலகாலம் வாஸம் செய்தார்.'

(Ref முகவுரை in E. V.) V.

8. The present Swamiji's speach at Nerunjipettai on 13—4—27 has also been noted.

9. A prlnted book containning re-prints of some Copper grants already appeard in 1916, edited by Mr. Gopinatha Rao. Only ten grants are edited. "Thereby hangs a tale". Mr. M. Subramaniam's letter to the 'Hindu' dated 27-6-1954, shows considerable light on this matter. Paras 6, 7, 8, of the letter: 'The portion relating to Sri Sankaracharya of Kumbakonam is found in pages 615 and 616 of the II volume on the Col. Mackenzie's collections published by Wilson in 1828. It is extracted below. 'Page 615 Report of Babu Rao, Mahratta Translator to Col. C. Mackenzie of his Journey to Pondichery. Karaikkal etc. along the coast for the purpose of collecting historical information, coins etc. from 24-12-1816 to 27-5-1817, April 8-9-1817'. Proceeding by way of Nachar Guddi, I arrived at Kumbakonam collecting some coins thereof from the Shroffs. Copper plate grants: 10th April. I visited the *Chief Priest of Sankarachari* expending 4 rupees on fruit etc. to introduce myself and requested him to

give me a copy of the copper inscriptions he had in his Matham, but some of the Karyastulu or Manager of the Matham directly denied that there were any inscription... Then confiding in my assertion that I had only to copy inscriptions and collect historical information ... He took me into his agraharam and showed me about 125 copper sasanams each contained in 5 or 6 copper plates; he gave me a copy of two..."

Paragraph 8 of M.S.'s letter: "In the light of the information supplied by Bapu Rao it is clear that at this time, the Mutt was in possession of 125 copper plate grants, each consisting of 5 or 6 plates. But we are at a loss to make out what became of them as only 10 copper plate grants that are published by Gopinatha Rao are in the possession of the Mutt today. It is said however that many of the copper plates were melted down for being converted into copper vessels...". That this was what happened is inferred by the fact, that some of the copper plates studied by G. Rao are fragments and consisted of one or two plates." But I have to bring to the notice of Mr. M. S. that the new claim assumed in latter years in calling their Mutt also as Sarada Mutt in Kamakoti Pitha etc might have been the cause of the wanton destruction of all the 115 grants because they should have been given to Sringeri Sarada Mutt itself. Further, it may be safly said said that the alleged possessiou of the grants in the hands of 'the Chief Priest of Sankarachari' of Kumbakonam agraharam should have been only as trustees or agents of the Sringeri Mutt. It is also significant that the properties mentioned in the grants retained are only in Chingleput and Trichy Districts. More, in the next paragraph 10.

10. The attempt of the Mutt to print only 10 grants, "some of which are fragments and consist of one or two plates" is only to palm them off as proof of their new claim. An Impartial study of the same would only prove

the contrary. Late Mr. Gopinatha Rao in 'G' had also taken great pains, rather unsuccessfully, in his attempt to connect the Mutt as grantees of the same.

Grant I only one plate, last one of set, is stated to be of the Cyclic year 'Khara' in the month of Karkataka, i. e. 9-7-1291 A. D. It purports to be a grant from one Vijayakonda Gopaladeva (whose reign began in 1260 A. D.) to one Sankararya Yogi or Sankara Yogi residing at a Mutt west of Hastisailanatha (Vishnu Kanchi). But in the Guruparampara furnished by Atreya Krishna Sastrigal (in 'E') the name of the 48th head of the Mutt is given as Chandra Chudendra Sarasvati (1247-1297 A. D.) There is no mention of any Matham or Indrasarasvati for the donee of the said grant. On this grant Mr. H. Krishna Sastri in his annual report of epigraphy for the year 1915 writes, 'It is not clearly stated in the record if the Matha presided over by the Sankaracharya (only Sankararya Yogi) herein referred to was identical with the Sankaracharya Matham at Conjeevaram'. (Page 9 of 'G'). But Mr. Gopinatha Rao's observation in pages 10 and 11 of 'G' is rather overpitched.

Grants II and III are stated to be by the Vizianagar King Veera Narasimha (Devaraya) to one Mahadeva Sarasvati, disciple of Sadasiva Sarasvati before God Virupaksha on the bank of Tungabhadra. The year of the Grants is stated to be the Cyclic year Sukla in the month of Magha. The Samvat noted is S. 1429. But Gopinatha Rao states in page 18 of 'G' that S. 1429 does not correspond to Sukla which falls in S. 1432. On a reference to the Calendar, the Year Sukla falls in 1509-10 A. D. According to Guruparampara of A. K. S. in 'E' one Chandra Chudendra Sarasvati is given as the 53rd Acharya between 1507-1524 A. D. (succeeding Vyasachala Mahadevendra Sarasvati between 1498-1507 A. D.) Such grants in Sukla 1509-10 A. D. have therefore to be cansidered as

not genuine. Besides there is no reference either to Kanchi Mutt or the title of 'Indra Saraswati' now claimed as the exclusive monopoly by the Mutt.

Grants IV and V are of the time of Krishna Devaraya. Grant IV made on the Bank of Krishnaveni is dated Salivahana Saka 1444, corresponding to the Cyclic Year Swabhanu, i. e. 1523–24 A. D. and in favour of Chandra Chuda Sarasvati. Mr. Gopinatha Rao says in 'G' (in 1916 A. D.) that the Swami should be the same as Chandra Sekharendra Sarasvati of the list supplied by the Gururatna Malika and whose date as calculated from the list comes to Saka 1429–1445. But A. K. S. in 1925 (in 'E') gives the Swami's name as Chandra Chudendra Sarasvati between 1507–1524 A. D. Which is correct, Sekhara or Chuda? Anyhow the title of Indra Sarasvati is absent and there is no mention of any Pitha or Matha.

Grant V made on the bank of Tungabhadra is dated Saka Samvat 1450 corresponding to the cyclic year Virodhi (1529–1530 A. D.) Visakha Paurnami and grantee is Sadasiva Sarasvati disciple of Chandra Sekhara Sarasvati Sekhara is found here. But according to A. K. S. in 'E' the name of the Swami is given as Sarvajna Sadasiva Bodhendra Sarasvati between 1524–39 A. D. and not as Sadasiva Sarasvati as found in the document. The identity of the grantee is not beyond doubt. But anyhow the title 'Indra Saraswati' is absent and there is no mention of any Pitha or Matha in the Grant. Besides the date of the Grant according to L. D. Samikannu Pillai is 3–5–1528 A. D. and not 1529–30 A. D. (Rg; Page 67 of 'G')

Grant VI in 22 lines, is a 'fragmentary inscription engraved on only one side of a plate which belonged to a set, the remaining plates of which seem to have been lost... ... In it the genealogy of the Kings of Karnata Dynasty is traced from the Moon... ... The last name found there is Bukka. It does not contain anything relevant.

Grant VII. This is engraved on the 2 sides of a single plate in Tamil characters and alphabet and is at the time of the Pudukottai Chief Vijayaraghunatha Thondaman, son of Tirumalayappa Thondaman, on the 15th Thai in the year Dundubhi (Saka stated to be 1613 is not accurate). Dundubhi is in 1682–3 A. D. The grantee is one Venkatakrishnayyan, son of Venkatayyan of Kanchipuram. The document is a mere undertaking (in the nature of a perpetual lease) by the members of the Araiya community in the southern portion of Anbil, to give some doles in perpetuity. The contention that the grantee is also an agent of the Mutt is highly far-fetched. The name of the Mutt or the alleged head is conspicuously absent, in the document.

Grant No. X: ' The inscription is engraved on 2 sides of a single plate in an extremely slip-shod manner and in a kind of Nagari character which is quite modern' - Ref. P 125 of ' G '. The grant is dated 15th Tithi of the Bright Half of the month Visakha in the year ' Prabhava ' corresponding to Saka year 1608 i. e. 1687–1688 A. D, on the occasion of Lunar Eclipse. The donor is one Mahadevendra Sarasvati disciple of Chandra Sekharendra Sarasvati of the Sarada Matha at Kanchi and the grantee is one Rama Sastri, in respect of lands in the village of Melupakkam and some taxes, two varahas per annum from the Matha and two sites etc. Objection (twofold) arises :—

(i) In the Guruparampara given by A. K. S. in ' E ' the head of the Matha is given as ' Bhagavannama Bodhendra Sarasvati' between the years 1638 to 1692 A.D.

(ii) L. D. Samikannu Pillai's criticism is found in P. 126 of 'G' " s. 1608, Prabhava Visakha Suddhi 15, Saturday Lunar Eclipse, s. 1608, = A. D. 1686–87. But Prabhava was A. D. 1687–88. The day intended was Saturday 16th April 1687 A. D. There was no lunar eclipse on the day in question".

In view of the double objections, the genuineness of the document is open to serious doubt. At any event, the document has to be brushed aside as useless, because it may be a self-serving document got up by the Mutt enthusiasts in later years. The custody of this grant with the Mutt is also mysterious.

Note :—[Akkanna and Maddhanna who are alleged to be the (ill fated Brahmin Ministers of Kuth Shahi Sultans Done away with by the Moghul Emperor in October 1685 A. D. (Ref: P. 132 of 'G'). are stated to be the grantors of the properties to the Mutt; but no grant is produced: Even Mr. Gopinatha Rao is not able to state definitely when such grant was made to the Mutt.]

Grant VIII. (In Telugu characters) is stated to be during the reign of Vijayaranga Chokkanatha Nayanivaru in Saka 1630 corrrespoding to the cyclic year 'Vikriti' month of Karthikai, i. e. November/December 1710–11 A. D. The grantee is merely described as 'Loka Guru Srimad Sankaracharya Swamuluvaru' to perform some Kattalai in Jambukeswaram. It is admitted both by N. K. V. and A. K. S. that the Kumbakonam Mutt was not at Kumbakonam at that time and one Mahadevendra Sarasvati was the alleged head between 1704–1729. This name is not mentioned at all in the document, but it is not therefore surprising that the present title claimed by the Mutt is also sought to be appropriated by this grant !! Lines 15 to 19 of the grant refer to a Matha in Ponvasikondan Street. P. 110 of 'G' gives :—"The Swami having his own Matha from olden times situated in Ponvasikondan street, Gajaranya Kshetra' commanded us that in that Matha, charities such as feeding, annadana, etc. should be conducted perpetually'. On this Gopinatha Rao's observation at pages 103, 104 of G runs thus: 'The places mentioned in this inscription are Gajaranya Kshetra, Ponvasikondan street in it... ... Gajaranyakshetra is

another name of Jambukesvaram — which of the present streets of this town was known as the Ponvasikondan street cannot be ascertained. The name of Ponvasikondan has reference to the history of the Saiva Saint Thirugnana Sambandha '. Further comment is needles.

Grant No. IX. A Firman by the Emperor of Delhi ? Hijira 1088 or 1710 A. D. It is in Telugu script. Lines 1-12 is Sanskrit, Line 13-27 is persian and, Lines 27-39 is Sanskrit, and 40-47 is Telugu, 48-58 Persian. The grant embodies an annual inam of 115 Varahas for the purpose of worship and daily offerings to God Chandramaulisvara and Brahmin feeding in favour of Swami Paramahamsa Parivrajakacharya of the Sarada Mutt in Kanchi otherwise known as the ***Satyavratakshetra. The name of the donee Acharya is Significantly absent.*** There is no mention of Kamakoti Pitha or title of Indra Sarasvati to be inferred from this document. The emperor's name is not mentioned. The grant appears to be after all a general order issued under the signature of one Talmada Bhanuji. District Revenue accountant.

It is therefore safe to presume that the grants now published in 1916 do not support the new claim of the Matha which may be taken only as a honourable encroachment on the properties of the Sringeri Mutt, the parent Mutt for the Dakshina Desa established by Sri Sankara Bhagavad Pada.

11. The final propaganda reaches a climax in 1934 by one Chinnasami Sastri, Professor of Mimamsa College of Oriental Learning, Benaras Hindu University (apparently a new recruit to the Mutt) published in the 'leader' Allahabad dated 19—7—34: 'The Kamakoti Pitha Mutt was first established by Adi Sankara at Kanchi about 490 B. C. after his conquest throughout India... ... and after establishlng four Mutts for the propagation of Advita doctrine, at Sringeri, Badarinath, Dwaraka, Puri... ... as the

founder and first occupant of the Gadi of Kamakoti Pitha, he made Conjeevaram his central seat for the rest of his life on earth in human form and placing in his Puja the first and foremost of the five lingas he had brought from Kailasa viz. 'Yoga linga'... and thus resolved to spend last years of his Human life... Sri Adi Sankara left the human body at Conjeevaram in the 32nd year i. e. 477 B.C. (Ref: P. ~~33 and~~ 34 of B). This was followed by another notification in 'Hindi' in the 'Pandita Patra' dated 10—9—34 by Pandit Venkateswara Sastri who averred that the Kumbakonam Mutt alone deserved the Jagadguru Title. (Ref: P. ~~32 and~~ 35 of 'B'.)

CHAPTER V

Reaction in Literary Circles
K. Mutt Literature Criticized.

1. 'Action is followed by Reaction.' The Mntt's propaganda had also a severe reaction amongst scholars in the whole of India inclusive of Tanjore District. One Bhatta Sri Narayana Sastri of the family of Mahadeva Dikshita, younger brother of Ramasami Sastri residing in the village of Kaveripatnam, near Kumbakonam, has written in Sanskrit a critical treatise called, 'Acharya Charitra Vimarsa', the second part of which is published in 'B' (Pages 8-31). In the said Vimarsa, he has made a critical discussion of all the authorities for and against the Kumbakonam Mutt. He does not agree with the novel statements contained in Kumbakonam Mutt's Ananda Giri's Sankara's life at all. Five questions which were raised by him are answered as follows:—

(i) That Sankara was born at Kaladi, son of Sivaguru.

(ii) That the first Matha established by Adi Sankara was the Sringeri Sarada Mutt, with Sureswaracharya as head.

(iii) That Sankara's life was 32.

(iv) That Sankara's final emancipation was not at Kanchi, but at the Himalayas.

(v) That Adi Sankara founded only four Mutts as found in Mathamnaya.

दिग्भागे पश्चिमे क्षेत्रे द्वारकाकालिकामठः ।
द्वितीये पूर्वदिग्भागे गोवर्धनमठः स्मृतः ॥
उत्तरस्यां श्रीमठः स्यात् क्षेत्रं बदरिकाश्रमम् ।
तुरीयो दक्षिणस्यां च शृङ्गेर्यां शारदामठः ॥ (Ref: P. 28 of 'B'

Besides the said conclusions he also finds that 'Indra Sampradaya' Suresvaracharya referred to by Anatananda Giri is an innovation not found in any of the authoritative books. He has also opined that Kanchi Matham claimed by the Kumbakonam Mutt is Apurvam, Asrutam, Ajnatam, Adrishtam. (P. 29 of 'B'). अपूर्वम्, अश्रुतम, अज्ञातम्, अदृष्टम ।

Note :—Regarding the Sankara Vijaya attributed to Anantanandagiri alleged to be one of the Sishyas of Adi Sankara, the words of Dr. Burnell. District Judge of Tanjore, who edited a catalogue of Manuscripts says in his remarks, "This seems to be quite a modern work written in the interests of the schismatic Mathas on the Coromandel Coast which have renounced obedience to the Sringeri Mutt, where Sankaracharya's legitimate successor resides. Ref :- "Burnells catalogue No, 9851 Page 95 left Column. Total number of Granthas 4400-4500 Tanjore Palace Library."

Even Mr. N. Venkataraman, an ardent supporter of the Kumbakonam Mutt says in his book that it is 'valueless and obviously a forgery, for the author who claims as a disciple of the Great Teacher himself, refers to Ramanuja and Madhwa, who lived in the 11th and 12th centuries respectively."

2. Sankarabhyudaya, attributed to Rajachudamani Dikshita was published in the Sanskrit Journal 'Sahridaya' some years ago. Even in this, there is no mention of any Mutt at Kanchi. The last stanza of the 8th Sarga says:

कम्पातीरनिवासिनीं अनुदिनं कामेश्वरीं अर्चयन्
ब्रह्मानन्दमविन्दत त्रिजगतां क्षेमंकरः शङ्करः ॥

The plain meaning is that Sankara experienced the bliss of Brahma by worshipping Kamakshi. It can never mean that Sankara continued to stay there or that he died there, much less that he founded a mutt there.

Note :—The manuscript for Sargam 7 and 8 was supplied to the editor by the Kumbakonam Mutt !!). Even this sloka undergoes a later alteration. 'निवासिनीं' is changed to 'उपेत्य' (vide Kumbakonam Mutt's Sankarajayanti Malar 1953 page 8), just to mislead the real Sankara Bhaktas, i. e. that Sankara *again came* to Kanchi, worshipped Kamakshi and obtained Eternal Bliss !

3. '*Vyasachaliyam*'. The alleged final emancipation of Adi Sankara at Kanchi and grant of 'Indra' title to Sankara are not found in the book, 'Vyasachaliya' recently published by the curator, Government Oriental Manuscript Library in 1954. (*Note* :—The Kumbakonam Mutt has also sent two manuscripts-for the said printing). On page iv of the introduction to the said book, the curator says, " There are not enough details about the author Vyasachaliya either in this work or in any other works and so it would be a vain attempt to deal with his life history". It may be noted at the outset that this book has about 520 slokas common to Madhaviyam. Regarding the said book, I have sent a critical review to the curator at the end of August 1956, with a certificate of posting and the copy of the letter is reproduced: " Sir, I had occassion to see your recent publication 'Vyasachaliya' Sankara Vijaya. You refer to it as both ancient and excellent. In proof of its

ancient nature, you quote in your introduction a sloka beginning, 'व्यासाचलप्रमुखपण्डित: ।' as from Madhaviya's opening chapter. I do not find it in the Poona Edition or in any manuscript. I do not understand wherefrom you got it. You also refer to another sloka 'नेता यत्र...' which is found in that book, but your assumption that the reference is to one Vyasachala Kavi, other than the author himself, is obviously untenable, as the next sloka beginning. 'तत्रादिम उपोद्घातो...' makes it clear that the Kavya mentioned in the previous sloka is the one referred to as 'तत्र' thus the words Vyasachalakavi can only apply to the author, Madhava himself and not to anybody else. In an earlier sloka, he calls himself 'Abhinava Kalidasa'. Again you refer to Govindanatha's Sankaracharya Charita and quote a sloka from it referring to Vyasachala Kavi and then refer to Keraliya Sankara Vijayam as if it were a distinct book and quote another sloka from it. Both the stanzas are found in the former. I do not think it fair to give the same book two names and quote them as distinct authority. The present publication contains two full chapters dealing with the story of Upamanyu and nearly 200 stanzas in quite an erotic spirit under the gain of describing the seasons etc., besides being disproportionate. They are quite irrelevant and out of place in a poem dealing with the life of Sri Sankara, and the manner of their introduction is equally inapt. You call this publication excellent. Tastes differ. I expected that the introduction to a book would have a direct bearing on the subject contained in that book. But your account of Sri Sankara's life apparently taken from Anantanandagiri is not borne out at all by the present publication. I do not consider it material to point out other inaccuracies therein in addition to printing mistakes. You point out in your addenda slip that four out of the five slokas quoted by Atma Bodhendra as from Vyasachaliya are not found here. In fairness it should have been pointed out that the other sloka has been misquoted by Atma Bodhendra."

The original of the misquoted Sloka No. 82 in Chapter XII reads :

एवं निरुत्तरपदां स विधाय देवीं सर्वज्ञपीठमधिरुह्य ननन्द सभ्यः ।
माता गिरामपि तथा पुरुषैश्च सभ्यैः संभावितो रुचिरदेशमयं जगाम ॥

For ननन्द सभ्यः, मठे स्वक्लृप्ते is found and रुचिरदेशमयं जगाम । is changed to "कमपि कालमुवास काञ्च्याम्" to make it appear that the ascension of Sarvajna Pitha was at Kanchi itself, that he established a Mutt there and that he stayed there for some time ! !

That the Sarvajna Pitha was in Kashmir is in Slokas 30 and 31.

काश्मीराख्यं मण्डलं तत्र शस्त्रं यत्रास्ते सा शारदा वागधीशा ।
द्वारैर्युक्तं मण्डपैः सच्चतुर्भिर्देव्या गेहं यत्र सर्वज्ञपीठम् ॥

In the second of the omitted four Slokas, it is stated that Sankara left his body at Kanchi. Sloka 86 of Chapter XII of the new publication directly contradicts this view and it specifically says that Sankara ascended a high mountain and disappeared from view.

गोवृन्दैरभिभासयन्नभिमतानर्थान्विशेषार्थदान्
व्योमव्यापि पदे स्थितो निरवधावुत्थाय गोत्रोत्तमात् ।
संगृह्णन्वसुधातले विपुलभास्सारं सुसंपूजितः
श्रीमच्छंकरभास्करो विजयते मुष्णन् जनानां तमः ॥

Thus the Kumbakonam Mutt's claim is negatived,

3. (a) Besides a reference is also made to the penultimate Sloka of the 8th Sarga of Patanjali Charita (Kavyamala Publication) काञ्चीपुरे स्थितिमवाप स शङ्करार्यः । Even here there is no mention of founding any Mutt at Kanchi though he may have stayed there for some days. About 16 Slokas in this Sarga are practically the same as those found in Madhaviyam. Regarding the said 3 works mentioned in paras 2, 3, 3a, one glaring feature is that a number of slokas appear to be common to them showing the

probability of the same author writing them all and copying from "Madhaviyam".

4. Sivarahasya is alleged to be an authority for the Mutt. I have already given in Chapter I paragraph 3 & 5 37-59 slokas. In the Mutt version slokas 47 to 59 are absent and Sloka No. 46 alone is retained with alterations. The original reading already given is as follows :—

तद्योगभोगवरमुक्ति[1] सुमोक्षयोग-
लिंगार्चनाप्राप्तजयः सकामम्[2] ।
[3] तान्वै विजित्य तरसा क्षतशास्त्रजालैः (वादैः)
मिश्रांस्ततो नैजमवाप लोकम्[4] ॥ ४६ ॥

In N. K. V's book of 1915 (C) No. 2 जयः सकामं is altered to जयस्वकाश्रमे, while No. 4. ततौ नैजमवाप लोकम् is altered to स काञ्च्यामथ सिद्धिमाप ।

The reading in the preface of Kanchi Mahatmya (Ref: 'F') in 1927 undergoes a further alteration: No. 1 मुक्ति is altered to सिद्धि and No. 3. तान्वै is altered into प्राप्तान् with a translation, ஸ்ரீ சங்கரர் வாதத்திற்கு வந்தவரை ஜயித்து காஞ்சியில் பிரமீ பாவத்தை யடைந்தார்கள். The reason is obvious. The Mutt wanted to create an impression in the popular mind that 'He' passed away at Kanchi itself.

Even adopting the reading as सिद्धि scholars would not give that narrow meaning. Bhatta Sri Narayana Sastri (in P. 26 of 'B') explains it in his Vimarsa referred to in first paragraph. He is of the view that सिद्धि 'Siddhi' does not mean salvation, but only मनोरथ सिद्धिमाप । i. e. He got fruits of his disire. In 'B' page 26, he has also given his explanation.

"सिद्धिशब्दो न मोक्षवाचकः । कुतः ? । शक्तेर्मानाऽभावात, न लक्षणया मुख्यार्थबाधाऽभावात् । न व्यञ्जनमूलाऽभावात् । अतः साधनार्थः — मनोरथस्य सिद्धिमवाप इत्यर्थः ।"

ஸித்தி எப்படி மோக்ஷம் என்று சொல்ல முடியும்? சக்தி மூலமாகவும் மோக்ஷம் என்று சொல்ல முடியாது, முக்கியமான அர்த்தத்திற்கு பாதகமில்லாததினால் லக்ஷணையாலேயும் சொல்ல முடியாது. அதற்கு வேண்டிய காரணமில்லாததால் வியஞ்சனையாலும் சொல்ல முடியாது."

Besides the first line of the next sloka No. 47, deleted by the Mutt काञ्च्यां तपः सिद्धिमवाप्य दण्डी । makes it clear that siddhi just referred to in the preceding line, cannot possibly mean 'Final liberation'. At any event, it can never mean to be understood as meaning that Sankara established any Mutt at Kanchi.

Re the final emancipation of Adi Sankara the latest version as found in page 16 of 'K' (1957 edition) is as follows:—"கைலாச யாத்திரையின் பொருட்டு காமகோடி பிலமாகிய குகையில் இறங்கி அந்தர்த்தியானம் ஆனார்." A novel suggestion.! Let the readers judge for themselves.

5. Reference is also made to Bhagavatam and Naishadham to show the existence of the Mutt and the alleged Puja of Yogalinga:

(i) The first pada of Sloka 14, of 79th Adhyaya in Dasamaskandham, is कामकोष्णीं पुरीं काञ्चीं is misquoted as कामकोटि पुरीं काञ्चीम् ।

(ii) The last line of the 38th Sloka in Sarga 12 of नैषधम् reads as 'यत्रासौ जलदेवता स्फटिकभूर्जागर्ति यागेश्वरः ॥' The last word 'Yageswara' is altered to 'Yogesvara' and the sloka palmed off as showing the existence of the alleged Yogalinga in the Mutt. But unfortunately यागेश्वर is the correct reading and it has been so adopted by all commentators of Naishadha. Yagesvara is the Presiding Deity Ekambaranatha in the Sacred Kanchi Kshetra, where Lord Brahma performed the Asvamedha Yaga. It is absurd to think otherwise. Further, the commentators have also split the word as Ya+Ageswara.

6. *Guruparampara:* The main authority is one Guru Ratna Malika, an omnibus production alleged to have been compiled by *Sadasivendra* Sarasvati of Nerur, on whom the authorship is foisted. This is supposed to contain all the heads of the Mutt from the beginning.

(i) Regarding this, Atreya Krishna Sastrigal says at Page 41 of his book 'E' "சரித்திர வாயிலாக நிர்ணயம் செய்யக் கூடாத முதல் 1 முதல் 11-வது ஸ்வாமிகளின் (i. e. 476–B. C. to 272 A. D. about seven centuries) கால வரையை ஸ்ரீகாமகோடி மடம் வம்சாவளியில் குறித்தவாறே எழுதுகிறேன்." It may be stated here that there is a considerable variation of the dates etc. assigned to the various heads of the Mutt. Atreya Sastrial in his book 'E' omits Adi Sankara and Suresvara Charya and his No. 1 head begins only from Sarvagna between 476 to 364 B. C. But in the guruparampara of the K. Mutt jubilee edition of 1957, Suresvara Charya is shown as the 2nd head from 476 B. C. to 406 B C. and Sarvagna is shown as the 3rd head as between 406 B. C. to 394 B. C. The dates of the Siddhis of the successors, 4th 5th 6th & 7th are given as 298 B. C. 235 B. C. 154 B. C. and 85 B. C. respectively. It is at variance with the dates given by Atreya Sastrial i. e. 364 B. C. for the 3rd, 268 B. C. for the 4th, 205 B. C. for the 5th, 124 B C. for the 6th and 55 B. C. for the 7th i. e. a change of 30 years for each head is rather mysterious and it throws a dark cloud of suspicion on the reliability of the Guruparampara Vamsavali of the Mutt. Swamijis 12 to 24 i. e. from 272 A. D. to 576 A. D. are alleged to have been taken from the North, consisting of Andhras, Maharashtras Kashmiris, Ujjainese, Hastagiri, Mithila etc., and all of them except 24 are alleged to have attained their final liberation in the far off places in the North. The other Swamijis from 564 A. D. up to date, consist of Andhras, Dravidas, Kashmiris, Kannadas etc. of various places, many of them appear to have been well-known authors on Vedanta or otherwise heroes etc. in Sanskrit literature,

and it is not a difficult matter to evolve a continuous parampara.

Atreya Krishna Sastrigal points out the glaring instance of 'Muka Sankarendra Sarasvati' the alleged 18th head of the Mutt (398 A. D. to 437 A. D.) and says that his story is found in "Rajatarangini".

It is not therefore improbable that the North Indian names or heroes (found in Katha-sarit-sagara, Brihatkatha Manjari, Vikramarka Charitra, Bhoja Charitra and other folk tales current in the land) as well as South Indian names are conveniently grafted on to the loose strings of the Parampara. The compiler is safe at this distance of time, as the names grafted are incapable of verification or contradiction.

Note :— Some of my literary friends and scholars inform me that many of the Swamijis, alleged to be the heads of the Kumbakonam Mutt, do not refer to the Central Mutt, nor call themselves as Sishyas of their alleged Acharyas of the Kumbakonam Mutt mentioned in the Guruparampara, nor call themselves as 'Indra Sarasvatis–an omnibus title assumed by many Pandits and Scholars unconnected with the Kumbakonam Mutt.

Besides, the alleged authorship of Gururatna Malika by Nerur Sadasiva Brahmam is also open to serious objection and other matters relating to Paramahamsa Suresvaracharya have also to be further clarified. All these are now the subject of my detailed study for a future thesis.

(ii) In addition, I find an astounding statement in Atreya Krishna Sastrigal's book of 1925 (E), namely :— Out of the four heads of the Kumbakonam Mutt heads, Nos. 7, 14, 18 and 36, 1st is made the Shanmata Sthapanacharya, the 2nd treated the Kerala King, the 3rd is the Mukakavi and the 4th is alleged to have been born in Chidambaram

and ascended the Sarvajna Pitha at Kashmir and disappeared in the Dattatreya Cave and that Vidya Tirtha of the Sringeri Mutt (1228 – 1333 A. D.) is coolly grafted as the 49th head of the Mutt with the period assigned to him as between 1297 to 1385 A. D. and that his final liberation was at Himachala Pradesh. A clever distribution, of Adi Sankara's life into the life of 5 later Swamijis !! and according to A. K. Sastrial only creating 'மயக்கம்' amongst scholars now. !!

7. The ambition of the Kumbakonam Mutt set afloat by Pandit Chinnasami Sastri of Benares University on 19—7—1934 in the 'Leader' at Allahabad and others, was again shattered to pieces at the famous and historic meeting held on 30—9—1934, in the Bhiharipuri Mutt under the Presidency of the distinguished professor of the Government Sanskrit College, Pandit Haran Chandra Bhattacharyaji. The Pandits etc. came to the conclusion signed by seventy one eminent scholars, pandits and Matadhipatis, that they could not go back upon the earlier Benares Vyavastha of 1886 (Magha Sukla Ekadasi Vikrama Saka). A literary criticism of the Kumbakonam Mutt publications (I infer it to have been made by Darsana Kesari Pandit Gopala Sastri) is also incorporated in the resolution passed on 30-9-34 (Ref. Pages 74 to 81 of 'B'). A detailed report of the Proceedings of the said meeting has been published in the paper 'Mantri'. It is further stated there that the Kumbakonam Mutt's representatives also participated in the discussion. The approval of the said resolution has been published in the news papers, Pancha Janva, Trilinga, Ugantar, Satya-vadi, the Indian Mirror, Surya, Leader etc. (P. 48 of 'B')

The meeting held all points against the Kumbakonam Mutt, a summary of which is given hereunder :—

(i) That 'Sivarahasya' relied on by the Mutt, with many alterations and changes cannot be relied on.

(ii) That the alleged work of Anantanandagiri, whose authorship also was called in question could not be taken as authority.

(iii) That change of Yageswara into 'Yogeswara' is a deliberate alteration and any reference to Yogalinga in Naishadham is untenable.

(iv) That the title of Indra Sarasvati is a myth and beyond the ten orders ordained in the Sastras.

(v) That the alleged Mahavakya 'Om Tat Sat' is clearly beyond the four Mahavakyas already adopted by Adi Sankaracharya.

(vi) That at any event, removal to Kumbakonam is Sthanabhrashta, not fit for worship at all and so forth.

The final paragraph of the resolution in Sanskrit is as follows :—

'एतावता प्रबन्धेन कामकोटिकुम्भकोणमठाधिपैः स्वविषये प्रमाणत्वेन निर्दिष्टाः शिवरहस्य आनन्दगिरिशंकरविजय, नैषधकाव्य, यतिधर्मनिर्णाख्याः ग्रन्थाः तेषां अननुकूल एव, प्रत्युत अस्माकं अनुकूला भवन्ति, इत्यतः सिद्धं काञ्चीकामकोटिकुम्भकोणमठश्रीमच्छंकरभगवत्पादाचार्यैः न स्थापित इति ॥'

CHAPTER VI

The Kasi Yatra 1934—1935. etc.

1. (a) With such unstable foundation, the present Swamiji launches on a Kasi Yatra, for which he had already cleverly enough quoted Dikshita's Sloka in praise of the Andhras :

आन्ध्रत्वमान्ध्रभाषा च आन्ध्रदेशस्वजन्मभूः ।
तत्रापि याजुषी शाखा नाल्पस्य तपसः फलम् ॥

just to hood wink the Andhras.

(b) The arrival was given wide publicity inclusive of wall posters, heralded by Pandit Chinnaswami Sastri etc. referred to in paragraph 7 of the previous chapter. But the

Mutt was vehemently opposed by the North Indian Scholars, Pandits and Matadhipatis, which culminated in Historic Resolution of 30—9—34, noted in para 7 of Chapter V. The Swamiji was heckled in all directions and very many condemnatory speeches were made before and after. Opposition ran so high that one Matadhipati wrote thus:

" We...declare to the Vedic World of India that the head of the Kumbakonam Kamakoti Mutt is an impostor Sannyasin making much ado in the name of the Jagad Guru". (Ref: P. 65 of 'B').

The reply of the Swamiji on 7—10—34 irritated the opponents more and more and it gave rise to further queries and cross questions in papers and meetings etc(for further details See Pages 68-70 of 'B') On the whole there was only a cold reception in spite of the Mutt's self constituted Committee of hosts in Kasi. An alleged farewell meeting arranged on 9—3—35, seems to have ended in confusion and uproar, so much so that the Swamiji had to be taken out of the meeting with Police escort. (Ref: 'J')

2. (a) The Mutt enthusiasts, inclusive of Maha Mahopadhyaya N. S. Ananta Krishna Sastrigal, could not raise any protest when they were in Benares and it was left to the Bangiya Brahmana Sabha of Calcutta, by the issue of a hastily got up brochure in English, printed at Calcutta called, " Sri Sankaracharya, the Great and His connection with Kanchipura." An amazing and startling thing is found there. One of the signatories in the so called Vyavastha in Sanskrit is the otherwise noted Maha Mahopadhyaya N. S. Ananta Krishna Sastri of the Calcutta University who was also with the Swamiji as his Lieutinant at Benares.! The brochure (another propaganda of the Mutt) seems to have been got ready at the far off Calcutta even before March 1935 but it could not be presented at Benares due to the violent opposition there.

(b) The preface to the said brochure is in English and contains copious references to all the Mutt literature, severely condemned by the Benares Pandits etc., noted in the preceding pages. It only reminds me of the Village School master " Though vanquished he could argue still".

3. The following is found in the preface :

' The traditional Srimukha epithets of the Kumbakonam Mutt refer to the Pitha as ' Adhishtita ' and not ' Pratishthita ' only ascended and occupied and not newly established, thereby testifying to its prior existence mentioned in the Bhagavatam, Tantras and other ancient vernacular classics', Such a statement of the Calcutta Bangiya Sabha cuts at the very root of the alleged founding of the new and Central Mutt by Adi Sankara at Kanchi, the seal of which contains the following :

श्रीमच्छंकरभगवत्पादप्रतिष्ठितश्रीकामकोटिपीठ ।

In this connection, I may state that Kamakoti Peeta alias ' Sri Chakra ' is the heading given by Sthanikam C. V. Kamakoti Sastrial of Kanchi in his 1957 edition in Tamil of ' Kanchi Kamakshi Ambal Sthalapuranam Varalaru ' (Ref. Page 8 of the book) Therein he says that Kamakoti Peetha alias Sri Chakra is in front of Kamakshi Devi Seated right in the centre of the Gayatri Mantapam. Sri Devi alias Kamakshi is in Sukshuma form. Sri Chakra is in the middle of this Peeta. On the Margin are eight Sakties. Ever since the Devi came out of the Bilakasa, she is presiding in this ' Sri Chakra. ' The Kamakoti Peeta is there for ages worshipped and renovated (ஜீர்ணோத்தாரணம்) by great saints and seers. Easvara himself prayed in four yugas as saints Dhurvasa. Parasurama, Dhaumya, and Adi Sankara who had also renovated the Kamakoti Peeta and obtained Devi's blessings. Thus the alleged prathishta of Kamakoti Peeta by Adi Sankara is directly contradicted here. It is also correct to state here that the misquoted Kamakoshneem of the Bhagavatam for Kamakoti Peeta is

only an epithet of Goddess Kamakshi and it has no reference to the founding of the Kumbakonam Mutt at all.

4. (i) A casual reference is also made to an alleged suit 95/1844, Trichy Principal Sadr. Ameen Court regarding the repair of 'Thatanka'. The proceedings are printed by the Mutt in 1893–4 as a sort of self-defence after the historic decision of the Benares Vyavastha in 1886 A. D. In that suit, the Sringeri Mutt's agents at Trichy who could not prove their exclusive and sole right to the said repair, lost the suit. But whether the Kumbakonam Mutt had that right at all was not decided at all. Only a plea of Jus Tertii.

Judgment :— (Page 109 of 'H'):—

"பிருதை ஸ்தாபிக்க வேண்டியது வாதியுடைய காரியமாயிருந்ததினாலேயும், மேலெழுதிய காரணங்களால் ருசுவாகாமலிருக்கிறதுனாலேயும், முதல் பிரதிவாதியுடைய ஆதரவுகளேயும் சாக்ஷிகளுடைய ருசுக்களேயும் விவரிக்க வேண்டிய அவசரம் காணப்படவில்லை".

(ii) From a perusal of the pleadings, I notice a number of self-contradictory and conflicting statements by the Kumbakonam Mutt as the 1st Defendant in the said suit.

(a) (Ref: P. 57 of 'H'): Paragraph 2 of their W. S. dated 25–2–45 contains:—

'ஆதி பகவத்பாதாள் ஸ்ரீ சிருங்கேரியில் ஸ்ரீ சக்ரபிரதிஷ்டை செய்ததாக சங்கர விஜயம், ஆசாரிய விஜயம், மார்க்கண்டேய ஸம்ஹிதை முதலான பிரஸித்த கிரந்தங்களில் சொல்லவில்லை. சரஸ்வதி முதலான சகல தேவதைகளுக்கும் அதிதேவதையாயிருக்கிற ஸ்ரீ காமாக்ஷி அம்மனுக்கு (Chakra Raja (निकेतन) niketana) என்கிற பெயர் இருக்கிறபடியால், அந்த அம்மன் இருக்கிற ஸ்தானத்திலேயே ஸ்ரீ சக்ர பிரதிஷ்டை செய்யத் தகுமே தவிற, அதற்கு தாழ்மையாயிருக்கிற சரசுவதி பீடத்திலே ஸ்ரீ சக்ர பிரதிஷ்டை செய்ததாக சொல்வது லோக விருத்தமாகவும் சாஸ்திர விருத்தமாகவும் இருக்கிறது'.

(But they were not aware that Sarada and Kamakshi were distinct aspects of the Divine Mother and were not synonymous in their significance.)

(b) Next in Para 3 (Page 58 of 'H') they state that Sringeri Mutt was non-existent for a long time till Vidyaranya (alleged to be the Sishya's Sishya of the Kumbakonam Mutt) revived the Mutt and thence forward, the Sringeri Mutt can only be called a parampara of Vidyaranya as a subsidiary Mutt, "துண்டுமடத்தார்" and not Adi Sankara's Parampara ! !

(c) Ref: P. 14 of 'H' - Para 12 of their W. S. 16—11—44 they quote an order of the Resident: "........

தஞ்சாவூர் ராஜா அவர்கள் மூலமாய் ரெஸிடெண்டுக்கு திரிக்கை செய்து, அவர்கள் கவர்ண்மெண்டுக்கு தெரியப் படுத்தினதில் ஸ்ரீருங்கேரி மடத்துக்கும் 1ம் பிரதிவாதியே குருவென்றும், அப்பேர்க்கொத்த இவர்களுக்கு அனைவரும் வணக்கமும் மரியாதையும் செய்வார்கள் என்பதில் ஸந்தேகமேயில்லை. அப்பேர்க்கொற்ற முதல் பிரதிவாதியவர்களை சுவல்ப அந்தஸ்துள்ள வாதி மரியாதை தாழ்வாய் பிருதில் பேசியிருப்பதை கோர்ட்டாரவர்களே யோசிக்கவேணும்."

In the face of the conflicting statements. (a) that there could be no Chakra Pratishtha of Sringeri at all. (b) that at the most it is only 'Tundu at matham' of Sage Vidyaranya and (c) that Kumbakonam Mutt's Acharya is the Guru of the same, it is not surprising that the Kumbakonam Mutt with the lavish gifts and patronage of the then Rajahs etc., to gain cheap popularity, got themselves tacked on to the sacred Sringeri Mutt and the result has been that Kumbakonam Mutt's designation also undergoes a transformation in calling their Mutt as Sarada Mutt in Kamakoti Pitha ! ! Further, this transformation can only be taken as a remnant of the Kumbakonam Mutt's subordination to the Sringeri Sarada Mutt as a Sikkudayar Swami. In addition, the title of 'Jagad Guru' for the Kumbakonam Mutt is prominently absent in the cause title of the suit.

5. But the Kumbakonam Mutt people would not acknowledge defeat. Though their aerial castle without any foundation was shattered to pieces at Banares on two memorable occasions they are still collecting all the broken fragments of the debris and continue to give an incorrect lead in their own places, by repeatedly quoting all the misquoted slokas especially in their Sankara Jayanti Malar etc. publications sponsored by the Mutt.

6. I sincerely hope that genuine Bhaktas of Adi Jagadguru Sankara Bhagavad Padacharya would realise the utter hollowness of the Kumbakonam Mutt's claim in all its aspects and will not allow themselves to be weaned away from their hereditary allegiance to the four mutts legitimately founded by Adi Sankara in the Four Directions and by paying reverential obeisance, especially to the sacred Sringeri Sarada Mutt, the only parent Mutt established by Adi Sankara for the whole of South India lying between the East and the West Coast.

Conclussion.

In the beginning of this thesis, I have begun with the 1st quarter of the famous Sloka in praise of the Goddess Divine Mother at Kalati composed by the Jagadguru Abhinava Narasimha Bharati Swami at Kalati in February 19, of the year 1910.

The entire sloka is given for all Sankara Bhaktas to follow :—

ईशोऽस्ति जन्म च विचित्रतरं हि जन्तोः
लोकान्तरं च निजकर्मकृतां सुखापम् ।
पापानि पापफलदाश्च तथैव लोकाः
इत्यम्ब ! लोकततये वितराशु बुद्धिम् ॥

श्रीरामजयम् ।
श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ।

Contents.

CHAPTER I - SANKARA'S AVATAR

1. Founding of Four Mutts ... 1
2. Sringeri Mutt in Rishyasringa Asrama ... 1
3. The history of the Sringeri Mutt. ... 2
4. Sankara's life, etc. ... 4
5. Sankara's life according to Sivarahasya. ... 5

CHAPTER II - SECESSION OF KUMBAKONAM MUTT

1. Democratic Revolt in General ... 7
2. Kumbakonam Mutt's 'Secession' ... 7
3. Kumbakonam Swamiji's speech at Benares 7-10-1934. 8
4 ,, ,, ,, in Tamil 9
5. ,, ,, ,, in English 9
6. ,, ,, ,, at Nerunjipet 1927 Extracts from 'Arya Dharmam'. 10

CHAPTER III - KUMBAKONAM MUTT IN 18th & 19th CENTURIES

1. Kumbakonam Mutt's alleged migration to Kumbakonam; 'Sikkudayar Swami' a clue.
2. Maha Mahopadhyaya Kokkanda Venkataratnam Panthulu's criticism 80 years ago and Benares Vyavastha of 1886. 14
3. Kumbakonam Mutt's 63rd Swamiji's retreat from Jagannath. 15

CHAPTER IV - KUMBAKONAM MUTT'S PROPAGANDA IN 20th CENTURY

1. General ... 16
2. Ramasami Sastri's notification at Benares 1915 16
3. N. K. Venkatesam's book 1915 ... 17
4. Verncular Journal. 'Arya Dharmam' started 1916. 17

5. N. Venkataraman's book in 1923 17
6. Atreya Krishna Sastrigal's book 1925 17
7. Kanchi Mahatmyam with preface 1927 17
8. Swamiji's speech at Nerunjipettai 1927 18
9. Photo Prints of 10 Copper Grants in 1916 18
10. Review of the Copper Grants. ... 19
11. Final Tour Propaganda in 1934 and Chinnasami Sastri's notification. etc. ... 24

CHAPTER V - REACTION IN LITERARY CIRCLES

1. Bhatta Sri Narayana Sastries criticism - General and also with reference to Anantanandagiri's Sankara Vijayam etc. 25
2. Re. Sankarabhudaya ... 27
3. Re. Vyasachaliya ... 27
3. (a) Re. Patanjali Charita ... 29
4. K. Mutt's Sivarahasya ... 30
5. Re. Reference to Bhagavatam and Naishadham 31
6. K. Mutt's Guru Parampara ... 32
7. Historic Meeting on 30—9—34 of Benares Pandits etc. and their Resolution. ... 34

CHAPTER VI - KUMBAKONAM MUTT SWAMIJI'S KASI YATRA Etc.

1. Kumbakonam Mutt Swamiji's Kasi Yatra 1934—35 35
2. Testimonial of Calcutta Bangiya Sabha 36
3. Reference to the above. ... 37
4. Reference to pleadings of 1844 Suit. 38
5. K. Mutt's present activities. ... 40
6. A warning and Advice to Sankara Bhaktas & Conclusion. 40

Supplement —— 1-7.

श्रीरस्तु। श्रीशांबशिवाय नमः।

शिवरहस्ये नवमांशे षोडशोऽध्यायः

स्कन्धउवाच।

तदा गिरिजया पृष्टः त्रिकालज्ञस्त्रिलोचनः।
भविष्यच्छिवभक्तानां भक्तिसंवीक्ष्यविस्मयन्॥ १

मौलि मान्दोलयन्देवो बभाषे वचनंमुने।
शृणुत्व मेभिर्गणपैः मुनीशैश्च सुरैस्तथा॥ २

प्रभावं शिवभक्तानां कलौतु प्रभविष्यताम्।

ईश्वर उवाच।

शृणुदेवि भविष्यत्सत् भक्तानां चरितं कलौ॥ ३

वदामि संगृहेणैव श्रवणाद्भक्ति वर्धनम्।
गोपनीयं प्रयत्नेन नाख्येयं यस्य कस्यचित्॥ ४

पापघ्नं पुण्यमायुष्यम् श्रोतॄणां मंगळावहम्।
पापकर्मैक निरतान् विरतान् धर्मकर्मसु॥ ५

वर्णाश्रम परिभ्रष्टान् धर्मप्रस्रवणान् जनान्।
कल्यब्धौ मज्जमानां स्तान् दृष्टवानुक्रोशतोऽम्बिके॥ ६

मदंशजातं देवेशि कलावपि तपोधनम्।
केरलेषु तथा विप्रं जनयामि महेश्वरि॥ ७

तस्यैव चरितंतेऽद्य वक्ष्यामि शृणुशैलजे।
कल्यादि मे महादेवि सहस्र द्वितियात्परम्॥ ८

सारस्वताः तथा गौढा मिश्रान्कर्णाजनाद्विजाः।
आममीनाशनादेवि ह्यार्या वर्तानु वासिनः॥ ९

औत्तरा विन्ध्य निलया भविष्यन्ति महीतले ।
शब्दार्थ ज्ञान कुशलास्तर्क कर्कशबुद्धयः ॥ १०

जैना बौद्धा बुद्धियुक्ता मीमांसानिरताः कलौ ।
वेदबोधित वाक्यानां अन्यथैव प्ररोचकाः ॥ ११

प्रत्यक्ष वादकुशलाश्शल्यभूताः कलौशिवे ।
मिश्राश्शास्त्रमहाशस्त्रै रद्वैत छेदिनोऽम्बिके ॥ १२

कर्मैव परश्रेयो नैवेशः फलदायकः ।
इति युक्ति परामृष्ट वाक्यैरुद्बोधयन्तिच ॥ १३

तेन घोर कुलाचाराः कर्मसाराभवन्तिच ।
तेषामुत्पाटनार्थाय सृजामीशेमदंशनः ॥ १४

केरले शशलग्रामे विप्रपत्न्यांमदंशतः ।
भविष्यति महादेवि शंकराख्यो द्विजोत्तमः ॥ १५

उपनीतस्तदा माता वेदान्साङ्गान् ग्रहिष्यति ।
अब्दावधिततश्शब्दे विहृत्य सतुतर्कजां ॥ १६

मतिं मीमांसमानोऽसौ कृत्वा शास्त्रेषु निश्चयं ।
वादिमत्तद्विपवरान् शंकरोत्तम केसरी ॥ १७

भिनत्त्येवतथा शुद्धान् सिद्धविद्यानपिद्रुतं ।
जैनान्विजित्य तरसा तथान्यान्कुमतानुगान् ॥ १८

तदा मातरमामं त्र्य परिव्राट् स भविष्यति ।
परिव्राजक रुपेण मिश्रानाश्रम द्वेषकान् ॥ १९

दण्डहस्तस्तथा कुम्भी काषाय वसनोज्वलः ।
भस्मदिग्ध त्रिपुण्ड्रांको रुद्राक्षाभरणोज्वलः ॥ २०

ताररुद्राक्ष पारीण शिशव लिंगार्चनप्रियः ।
स्वशिष्यैस्तादृशै र्धुष्यन् भाष्यवाक्यानि सोऽम्बिके ॥ २१

मद्दत्त विद्ययाभिक्षु र्विराजति शशांकवत् ।
सोऽद्वैतोच्छेदकान् पापान् उच्छिद्याक्षिप्य तर्कतः ॥ २२

स्वमतानुगतान् देवि करोत्येव निरर्गळम् ।
तथापिप्रत्यतस्तेषां नैवासी च्छुति दर्शने ॥ २३

सूत उवाच

मिश्राश्शास्त्रार्थ कुशलास्तर्क कर्कशबुद्धयः ।
तेषामुद्बोधनार्थायतिष्ये भाष्यं करिष्यति ॥ २४

व्यासोपदिष्टसूत्राणां द्वैत वाक्यात्मनां शिवे ।
अद्वैतमेव सूत्रार्थं प्रमाणेन करिष्यति ॥ २५

अविमुक्ते समासीनं व्यासं वाक्यै र्विजित्यच ।
शंकरस्तौति हृष्टात्माशंकराख्योऽथमस्करी ॥ २६

शंकर उवाच

सत्यं सत्यं नेहनानास्ति किंचिदीशावास्यं ब्रह्म सत्यंच बाह्ये ।
ब्रह्मैवेदंब्रह्मपश्चात्पुरस्तादेको रुद्रोन नद्वितीयाय तस्थे ॥ २७

एकोदेवस्सर्वभूतेषुगूढो नानाकारोद्भासि भानैस्तदात्मता ।
पूर्णापूर्णो नामरूपैर्विहीनो विश्वातीतो विश्वनाथोमहेशः ॥ २८

भूतं भव्यं वर्तमानं त्वमीशोसामान्यं वेदेश कालादिहीनः ।
नातो मूर्ति वेदवेद्यस्यत्व संगस्संगीवत्वं लिंग संस्थो
विभासि ॥ २९

त्वद्भासावैसोमसूर्यानिलेन्द्राभीषैवेदेत्येषसूर्यश्चदेवः ।
त्वंवेदादौस्वर एकोमहेशो वेदान्तानां सारवाक्यार्थवेद्यः ॥ ३०

ओंकारार्थः पुरुषस्तं ऋतञ्च सत्यज्ञानानन्द भूमासि सोम ।
बद्धोमुक्तोनासि संगोह्य संगो प्राणप्राणो मनसस्त्वं मनश्च ॥ ३१

त्वत्तो वाचामनसा सन्निवृत्ताः तत्रानन्दज्ञानिनो बद्धभावाः।
त्वत्तो जातं भूतजातं महेशत्वयाजीवत्येव मेवं विचित्रम् ॥ ३२

त्वामेवान्ते संविशत्येव विश्वंत्वां वैकोवास्तौति तं स्तव्यमीशम्।
किंचिज्ज्ञात्वा सर्वभास्येव बुध्वात्वा मात्मानंवेत्तिदेवं महेशम्॥३३

ईश्वर उवाच

इति शंकर वाक्येन विश्वेशाख्यादहं तदा।
प्रादुर्बभूव लिंगात् स्वादलिंगोपि महेश्वरि॥ ३४

त्रिपुण्ड्र विलसत्बालश्चंद्रार्धकृत शेखरः।
नागाजिनोत्तरा संगो नीलकण्ठस्त्रिलोचनः॥ ३५

वरकाकोदराधीश राजद्वारस्त्वयांबया।
तमत्रैवं महादेवि प्रणतं यतिनां वरम्॥
शिष्यैश्च चतुर्भिश्चयुतं भस्मरुद्राक्ष भूषणम् ३६

ईश्वर उवाच

मदंशतस्त्वं जातोसि भुविचाद्वैत सिद्धये।
पापमिश्राश्रितै र्मार्गैः जैन दुर्बुद्धि बोधकैः॥ ३७

भिन्नवैदिक संसिद्धे अद्वैते द्वैतवाक्यतः।
तद्भेद गिरिवज्रस्त्वं संजातोऽसि मदंशतः॥ ३८

दुर्वासश्शापतो भूमौ जातां वाणीं विजित्यताम्।
अगस्त्य चरिते देशे तुङ्गातीरे सुनिर्मले॥ ३९

पुण्यक्षेत्रे द्विजवर स्थापयित्वासुपूजय।
यत्रास्ते ऋष्यश्रृङ्गस्य महर्षेराश्रमो महान्॥ ४०

कलावपि ततोऽद्वैत मार्गः ख्यातो भविष्यति।
द्वात्रिंश त परमायुस्ते शीघ्रं कैलासमावस॥ ४१

एतत्प्रतिगृह्णत्वं पंचलिंग सुपूजय ।
भस्मरुद्राक्षसंपन्नः पञ्चाक्षरपरायणः ॥ ४२

शतरुद्रावर्तनैश्च तारेण भसितेनच ।
बिल्वपत्रैश्च कुसुमैः नैवेद्यैर्विविधैरपि
त्रिवारं सावधानेन गच्छ सर्वं जयायच ॥ ४३

त्वदर्थं कैलासाचल वरं सुपावीगत महासमुद्यच्छन्द्राभं
स्फटिकधवलं लिंगकुलकम् ।
समासीनस्सोमो द्विमलमणि मौल्यर्चयपरं कलौ लिंगार्चायां
भवतिहि विमुक्तिः परतरा ॥ ४४

सशंकरोमां प्रणनाम मस्करी यशस्करी तस्करबर्यमार्यैं ।
संगृह्यलिंगान्निजगामवेगात् भूमौ सबुद्धार्हत मिश्रजैनान् ॥ ४५

तद्योग भोगवरमुक्तिसुमोक्ष योगलिंगार्चना प्राप्तजयः सकामं ।
तान्वैविजित्य तरसाक्षात शास्त्रजालैः मिश्रांस्ततोनैजमवाप
लोकम् ॥ ४६

काञ्च्यां तपस्सिद्धिमवाप्य दण्डीचण्डीशरुपो जगदाकलय्य ।
ब्रह्मैकविद्यां रचयन्सभाष्यं शारीरकंनाम जगादमोदात् ॥ ४७

व्यासेन संभाष्य समेत्यकाशीं तन्मण्डनार्यं परिखण्ड्यवाणीम ।
जेतुंशरीरान्तरमेत्य कामकलां जगाहे प्रमदावराभ्यः ॥ ४८

पुनःस्वकं देहमवाप्यतूर्णं पूर्णं निजंकाममथाकलय्य ।
वाणीं स जित्वैवतुतां मठेस्वे श्रृङ्गेरि काख्ये प्रणिवेश्य तुष्टः ॥ ४९

कापालिकंतंक्रकचं महोग्रं कर्णाटदेशे निखिलं विजित्य ।
गोकर्णमासाद्य तमीशमीद्यं स्तुत्वा महाराष्ट्रपदं प्रपेदे ॥ ५०

तत्रस्थितान् भास्करभट्टमुख्यान् तं नीलकण्ठं च तृणीकरिष्यन् ।
काश्मीरमासाद्य स शारदायाः सर्वज्ञपीठं परमारुरुक्षन् ॥ ५१

तत्रस्थितान्संप्रति सर्वपण्डितान् चार्वाकमुख्यान् विपुलान् विजित्य ।
स दक्षिणद्वारस्थं कवाटभेदं कृत्वासदेव्या विनिशङ्क्यमानः ॥ ५२

शङ्कां निराकृत्य निविश्यपीठे ततोबदर्याश्रममाप दण्डी ।
नारायणं तत्र तपज्ज्वलौघंकुण्डं प्रशीतस्य निवारणाय ॥ ५३

ध्यात्वा शिवंतत्र निविश्य तस्थौ कैलासदेशात्वृषभश्च देवाः ।
समेत्य संस्तुत्य यदायुषस्ते कालोगमत्त्वं वृषभेऽधिरोह ॥ ५४

इतिप्रचीर्णं प्रभुरात्मनिस्वे विचिन्त्यशिष्यान्निजगादमोदात् ।
यूयंचतुर्दिक्षु मठेषुलिंगैः साकंवसन्त्विति उपदिश्य हर्षात् ॥ ५५

विवेश पृष्टं वृषभस्यहस्तं संगृह्यवैरिञ्चिमथास्य दत्तम् ।
सर्वैश्च देवैरभिनन्द्यमानः सशं वेरस्तन्निजगामदेवः ॥ ५६ /क

विवेश कैलाश निवेशमच्छं सच्छब्दवृन्दारक बृन्दपूर्वम् ।
तदादि तच्छंकरभाष्यमेतत्भूमौजनं मुक्तिपदं ददाति ॥ ५७

एतत्तेऽभिहितं देवि मुख्यं मुक्तिपदावहम् ।
शांकरं चरितं लोले भविष्यति न संशयः ॥ ५८

इति श्रुत्वा महेशानाच्छरितं शंकरस्य सा ।
पुलकांकुर संहृष्टा प्रणनाम महेश्वरम् ॥ ५९

विज्ञापना

एतत् देशीयेषु कैचित्पुस्तकेषु 'काञ्च्यामथसिद्धिमाप'* इति श्लोक एव अध्यायपरिसमाप्तिर्दृश्यते उत्तरदेशीयेषु पुस्तकेषु 'प्रणनाम महेश्वरं' इति श्लोकान्ते अध्याय समाप्ति दृश्यते ।

* Sl. 46.

श्रीचित्सुखाचार्य माधवार्यादि कृत शंकर विजयादौ औत्तरपाठ मनुसृत्यैव कथासंदर्भस्य प्रदर्शितत्वेन एता दृश औत्तरा ह पाठ एवज्यायान्। एत द्देशीयेषु केषुचित्पुस्तकेषु, 'काञ्च्यां तपस्सिद्धि मवाप्य दन्डी' इति उत्तर ग्रन्थभागः। (भारते कृष्णार्जुनयोः श्रीकृष्णस्य महादेव प्रसादोद्धृश्यक कैलास यात्राप्रति पादको ग्रन्थभागः यथा कैश्चिदुद्धृतस्तथा) स्वाभिप्राय विरोधित्वात् कैश्चित्देशीयैः उद्धृत इति निश्चित्य औत्तरीयपाठानुसारेणैव मुद्रितोऽयं ग्रन्थः॥

(At the request of my friends, the entire portion of 'Sivarahasya' 16th adhyaya Navamamsa as found in the printed books with the विज्ञापना found in one of them, is given as supplement.)

K. S. SUNDARAMIAH.
May 1958.

Sri Ramakrishna Press, Madurai:-7-58.